

# PLANNING AHEAD

## Notes for the Planning Community

Volume 2, Issue 2

February 1999

---

### In This Issue

Notes from Jim Johnson .....	1
A Word from the Editor.....	3
FY2000 President's Budget .....	3
Planning Guidance Letter To Be Called Planning Guidance Memorandum .....	3
Species Alert - Bog Turtle .....	4
U.S. Foreign Waterborne Transportation Statistics Program Returns to the Corps .....	4
Hydrologic Engineering Center .....	5
Marie Dorian Dam Breaching.....	6
Puyallup River Levee Rehabilitation Project .....	6
Sammamish Weir Section 1135 Restoration Project.....	7
Native American Culture .....	8
Water Supply Handbook .....	9
Delegation of Authority for Water Supply Agreements and Reallocations .....	9
Submissions Deadline .....	9

### Notes from Jim Johnson

#### Planning Guidance and Planning Process

In the January Issue, I addressed the first of our planning mission objectives, planning outputs. This month, I would like to address our planning guidance and two related mission objectives: improving the planning process and improving the report production process.

Planning Guidance. The Corps of Engineers planning guidance was last substantially revised and consolidated in 1981, when former planning chief Lew Blakey embarked on a major initiative to distill the over 1200 pages of guidance. At that time, all planning guidance was consolidated in the

Planning Guidance Notebook, and the intent was to make all revisions only to the notebook, and not to issue separate guidance. Over the past twenty years, however, our planning guidance has evolved into a mix of documents, combining new guidance with old guidance, some of which is clearly outdated. Now is an appropriate time to review the Planning Guidance Notebook, and to get both our planning guidance and the process for developing and distributing it into shape.

This task is not just one of putting everything back into a single notebook, however, but rather converting the Planning Guidance Notebook into a clear, understandable document and one that also can be updated without losing its integrity. This is not an easy task. Our first mission will be to convert the main body of the Notebook into a document of less than one hundred pages that lays out the fundamental aspects of the planning process and its various parts in plain English. I don't anticipate that this document will change much through time. It also must be understandable to both planners and non-planners alike. It must contain the fundamentals that every project planner, project manager, and project delivery team needs to know in developing plans and planning reports. I expect to complete the core notebook this calendar year. As we get this process underway, we will provide you more information on details such as on connecting guidance to the core document, maintaining the guidance, and how to most effectively use conventional and advanced communication technologies. And most importantly, we will involve field offices in all phases and aspects of this process, from beginning to end.

Planning Process. The Corps of Engineers planning process has evolved considerably over

several decades to its current form. In the late 1970s, water resources development programs of the major Federal water development agencies (excluding the EPA) were required to be undertaken under a common set of *Principles and Standards*, and a set of carefully prescribed procedures for evaluating economic and environmental benefits and costs. In the early 1980s, agencies were given greater flexibility as the *Principles and Standards* were changed to *Principles and Guidelines*, which were not published as rules in the Code of Federal Regulations. The *Principles and Standards* and the *Principles and Guidelines* with their related procedures have provided the basis for Corps of Engineers water resources planning for over twenty-five years.

During that period, however, many things have changed. With the passage of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, the Corps entered the era of project cost sharing, including the sharing of feasibility study costs on a 50-50 basis with non-Federal partners. With the introduction of that cost-sharing, non-Federal interests have taken a greater role in the formulation and evaluation of projects. With ever increasing sensitivity to what types of project features non-Federal partners are willing to share, the types of projects we have formulated have changed. In addition, the types of tasks and work items have also changed. In all, the Corp planning process has evolved from a very comprehensive process to one increasingly focused on specific projects, although we are now giving renewed attention to the importance of watersheds.

We will review our planning guidance, consistent with current laws and policies, including the *Principles and Guidelines*, in an effort to bring greater consistency to our planning process. I expect the result to be a planning process that provides the holistic approach envisioned in the *Principles and Guidelines*, while producing plans and projects that reflect WRDA '86 and other legislation. The plans and projects resulting from our planning process should provide a common sense approach to weighing economic and environmental considerations in producing project outputs. The bottom line is that our plans and projects must solve the problems for which they are formulated, and do it in a way that is good for both the economy and the environment.

We also must carry out this planning process in a more timely and cost effective manner,

weighing what and how we plan with the costs of that process. We need to review every aspect of the planning process from problem identification through plan selection, and to look at all costs associated with the tasks of all organizations (engineering, real estate, counsel, etc.) involved in every step of the process.

Planning Report Production Process. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish the inefficiencies attributable to the planning process versus the planning report production process. Over the years our planning process, cost-sharing, policy and technical review and focus on customer satisfaction have improved, but we still are coming to grips with other built-in inefficiencies. Although we do things right on some reports from start to finish, I believe we should do that more consistently for all of our reports. We need to review how we get from the beginning of our process – from our reconnaissance reports through our feasibility reports – to the process of reviews culminating in the Chief's Reports, to determine what is working and what isn't.

We also need to be looking at the actual mechanics of report production, looking for opportunities to improve the quality of our reports while maintaining or lowering both time and production costs. We are entering a time of vastly changing technology, one where the practice of publishing large numbers of paper reports may be outdated, and the emergence of CD and web technologies must not only be recognized, but be fully utilized. Common databases, interactive software and innovations in electronic communication must be used not only to enhance our planning capabilities, but also to produce savings in the time and cost in our entire planning report production process.

Through this entire effort of looking at our planning guidance and our planning and report production processes, the underlying principles will be to do what makes sense and to rely heavily on the energy, creativity and common-sense problem solving of our field offices. We will be looking for your input and for your direct participation. Moreover, you will be informed and involved every step of the way. ❖

## A Word from the Editor

Harry Kitch – CECW-PD

We are very pleased to be able to include several articles in this issue from the field, FOA's and labs. We hope that we continue to get more and more such articles so that we can share this valuable information across the Corps. A note to future authors - please limit your articles to five or six paragraphs and present the highlights. ❖

## FY2000 President's Budget

Rennie Sherman –CECW-P

The President's FY2000 Budget includes \$135 million for General Investigations. This is a substantial decrease from the FY99 GI Appropriation. Only one new reconnaissance study start is included, Santa Ynez, California. The request for GI Remaining Items is generally consistent with their FY99 appropriation amounts. The substantial increase received in the Section 22 - Planning Assistance to States program in the FY99 Appropriation has not only been maintained, but also increased slightly to \$6.5 million. The continued productivity and efficiency of the S.22 program is critical in order to support this funding request. The request for the Floodplain Management Services Program is \$9 million.

The request for Construction General is approximately \$1.3 billion. The Continuing Authorities Program request is \$57 million, including \$14 million for the environmental authorities and \$43 million for the six traditional authorities. Although this is a significant decrease from the \$73 million appropriated in FY99, given anticipated carryover and historic expenditure levels, it should not create major problems. The President's Budget again requests \$25 million to initiate the Challenge 21 - Riverine Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Hazard Mitigation Program.

Details, including the state by state summaries, can be found on the Programs Management Homepage. ❖

## Planning Guidance Letter To Be Called Planning Guidance Memorandum

Brad Fowler – CECW-PD

### The PGL Twins Are Separated

Which of these famous clan feud stories is made up?

- a. Montague vs. Capulet
- b. McCoy vs. Hatfield
- c. MacDougall vs. Bruce
- d. MacDougall vs. MacAllister
- e. McPlanning vs. McPolicy

The answer depends on what the meaning of "made up" is. Does "made up" mean the story is a fiction and all parts of it are fictitious; or can it mean that something much like the story probably happened, but the particular details are imagined. The MacDougall vs. Bruce and McCoy vs. Hatfield family feuds are solid historically, but there probably never were a Montague and a Capulet family with star-crossed lovers Romeo and Juliet. These particulars were Shakespeare's imaginative work, but something like the Romeo and Juliet story may well have happened in feud-ridden 13<sup>th</sup> century Verona. A McPlanning vs. McPolicy feud, on the other hand, is a total fiction!

Still, little problems sometimes arise between even the best of friendly families. For example, keeping your guidance sources straight is a chore – is it not?! – and Planning Guidance Letter and Policy Guidance Letter have the same acronym (PGL). Thus, Planning Division is changing its guidance letter moniker to *Planning Guidance Memorandum* (PGM).

One change causes another however; the acronym PGM (Project Guidance Memorandum) is already in use. That guidance memo results from the feasibility review conference; it will now be called the Study Guidance Memorandum (SGM). The changed names appropriately maintain an implied hierarchy: planning guidance (in general) is superior to, higher than or prior to specific study guidance.

Economic Guidance Memorandums (EGM) will continue; most recent is EGM 99-05, Vessel Operating Costs FY99, and it's on its way to you.

By the way, the MacDougall vs. Bruce feud was brutal and long lasting in 14<sup>th</sup> century Scotland, and McCoy vs. Hatfield was our own homegrown feud varietal in 19<sup>th</sup> century West Virginia and Kentucky. But what about MacDougall vs. MacAllister? ❖

## Species Alert - Bog Turtle

*Dena D. Dickerson CEWES-ER-C*

One of North America's smallest turtles is in big trouble. The USFWS listed the bog turtle (*Clemmys muhlenbergii*) as a Federally threatened species in November 1997. Bog turtles are rare or completely absent in many regions where they once were fairly abundant. Severe declines in their numbers are attributed to: habitat destruction and fragmentation from agriculture and urban development; habitat succession due to invasive exotic and native plants; and illegal collecting for the pet trade. Widespread alteration of bog turtle habitat has resulted from draining, ditching, dredging, filling and flooding of wetlands for residential, urban and commercial development; road construction; agricultural activities; and pond and reservoir construction. Many wetlands occupied by bog turtles in agricultural areas are subject to impacts from livestock grazing.

The bog turtle is sparsely distributed over only a portion of its former range extending from the New England states south to Georgia. These turtles prefer open canopy areas of sphagnum bogs, swamps, and clear, slow-moving meadow streams with muddy bottoms. Bog turtles are usually found in small, discrete populations within these wetland habitats that are a mosaic of micro-habitats which include dry pockets, saturated areas, and areas that are periodically flooded. They utilize shallow water in spring and return to deeper water in winter. Bog turtles are semi-aquatic and only active during part of the year. These turtles may be difficult to locate during periods of inactivity from July through August or hibernation from October to April. Due to the rarity in nature, its small size, and unique habitats, it is difficult to obtain reliable bog turtle population demographics.

Through the Ecosystem Management and Restoration Research Program (EMRRP), Waterways Experiment Station is conducting a study to identify Corps projects with known or potential habitats for environmentally sensitive turtle

species. Corps projects have already been identified as having existing populations, potential habitat, or historical records for bog turtles. Proactive identification of this information provides valuable biological data for planning projects to formulate management alternatives and develop habitat restoration plans. Several Corps Districts have already addressed potential environmental issues concerning bog turtles. Additional information about bog turtles may be found at <http://www.xmission.com/~gastown/herpmed/bogturt.htm>, <http://www.tortoise.org/archives/bogturt.html>, and <http://www.gmu.edu/bios/bay/journal/current/turtles.htm>. ❖

## U.S. Foreign Waterborne Transportation Statistics Program Returns to the Corps

*Arlene L. Dietz, Director, Navigation Data Center*

The USACE, through its Navigation Data Center (NDC), was designated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as the Federal "Central Collection Agency" for the U.S. Foreign Waterborne Transportation Statistics Program effective 1 October 1998. This had been the responsibility of Census for the past 50 years. NDC's Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center (WCSC) is managing this program. The U.S. Customs Service serves as our partner who physically collects the data. Census provides the trade data. Canada sends us the Canadian imports from the U.S. (U.S. exports). The Maritime Administration, under contract with NDC, processes the vessel and trade data, and produces and distributes the former Census products to non-Corps users.

NDC will be initiating its reengineering of the program this year beginning with Federal and Public meetings (5 February and 4 March 1999, respectively). The Corps meeting held in 1997 provided input as to the Corps requirements. The reengineering is intended to fully integrate this program into NDC's family of data programs and most importantly, respond to the user needs, and particularly the Corps needs. The Corps was charged by OMB to continue to produce all the existing output until such time as we have

coordinated with key Federal and non-Federal users and redesigned the program and the products.

Historically, the summary data provided through WCSC included commodity, tonnage, U.S. port, vessel type, direction, and number of trips. The foreign detail records available to all Corps offices on an annual basis included the U.S. district/port, foreign port, country of origin/destination, SITC REV 3 commodity, shipping value and weight, vessel name, WCSC location code, draft, net registered tonnage, ballast, rig and operator.

The Corps now "owns" all of the former Census products which include the monthly and annual vessel movements and "Waterborne Databank"; quarterly and annual "U.S. Waterborne Exports and General Imports"; and annual "Vessel Entrances and Clearances". The basic input into "Vessel Entrance and Clearance" product has undergone a transformation during 1998 and continues into 1999. Customs agreed to an automation of the data collection and is now capturing dock level activity on a regular basis for over 70% of the entries. Earlier we had been lucky to get the correct channel, let alone the correct port. This is still evolving at Customs. We hope to have the dock level available to you in the 1999 data set. We will keep you posted.

If you have not seen the former Census products and would be willing to evaluate these from your perspective, please contact Norman Tague (e-mail: [norman.tague@marad.dot.gov](mailto:norman.tague@marad.dot.gov) or phone 202-366-2316). You may also request these and a Federal Questionnaire through Susan Hassett at WCSC (e-mail: [susan.k.hassett@usace.army.mil](mailto:susan.k.hassett@usace.army.mil) or phone 504-862-1453). Identify yourself and explain that you want to review these products and complete the Federal Questionnaire. Provide your feedback to WCSC, attention: Susan Hassett, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center, P.O. box 61280, New Orleans, LA 70161-1280 or fax 504-862-1423. ❖

## Hydrologic Engineering Center

*Darryl Davis – Director, HEC*

The Hydrologic Engineering Center (HEC) was established in 1964 to function as the Corps of Engineers national center of expertise in hydrologic engineering and analytical planning techniques and provide services Corps field offices and HQUSACE in research, training, and technical assistance. The Center, located in Davis, California, has a staff of 30 professional engineers and computer scientists complemented by five to 10 graduate students in water resources from the nearby University of California campus.

Major products of HEC research are general-purpose computer programs and companion user's instructions and applications guides. About twenty major computer programs for application in hydrologic engineering and planning analysis are distributed and supported. Also, about 500 student-weeks of training in a dozen courses are conducted annually. Videotapes of course presentations and lectures/workshops are provided and maintained for use by Corps offices and others. About two-thirds of the courses are sponsored by Civil Works Hydraulics and Hydrology Branch and the remaining one-third by Civil Works Planning Division. Technical assistance is available on a reimbursable basis.

Current activities and priorities reflect the emphasis on improving field office technology for accomplishing the Corps mission in a cost-effective manner. The current high priority activities include:

HEC NexGen Project. This highest priority HEC project is developing the successor software packages to the existing family of HEC batch computer programs. The new packages are updating the technical algorithms to current state-of-the-art methods and are being created to take advantage of computer hardware either now in Corps field offices and recent software engineering advances. The programs are designed to be operated through a graphical user interface, be highly visualization oriented, and integrated with other HEC programs to ensure seamless information exchange. Major releases have occurred of new software addressing river hydraulics (HEC-RAS), catchment analysis (HEC-HMS), and flood damage analysis with risk (HEC-FDA). These new programs are planned to

become the Corps' hydrologic engineering and planning analysis software of choice well into the next century.

#### Water Control Data System Modernization.

The Corps operates more than 600 dam and reservoir projects constructed under the Civil Works water resources program. The water control mission of the Corps is to regulate river flow with these projects to provide national benefits of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power generation, water supply, erosion control, environmental enhancement, and other authorized purposes. The Water Control Data System (WCDS) is the system that provides reservoir and river system status, flow, and decision support information needed to accomplish the water control mission. HEC is the System Developer in a project to modernize the WCDS in an intensive five-year software development period. Deployment will occur in the period 2000 to 2002.

**Risk-based Analysis.** Implementation of this HQUSACE initiative is well along. Intensified training and assistance will continue for the next several years, guidance updates will be required, and a fully capable software package (HEC-FDA) to support efficient field application is required. HEC is active in all these areas.

Information about services available may be obtained from Darryl W. Davis, Director Hydrologic Engineering Center, 609 Second Street, Davis, California 95616. Phone (530) 756-1104. Further information is available via the HEC Web site at: <http://www.hec.usace.army.mil> ❖

## Marie Dorian Dam Breaching

*Chris Hyland, CENWW*

The following is a short recap of the actions relating to a Section 1135 project being studied by the Walla Walla District (NWW) of the Corps of Engineers. NWW had planned a fish passage enhancement project under the Corps' Section 1135 authority, which consisted of two parts: 1) to build a new fish ladder at Nursery Street bridge; 2) to remove Marie Dorian Dam. The Marie Dorian dam on the Walla Walla River; near Milton-Freewater, Oregon is a small concrete irrigation dam, that was an impediment to upstream migration by anadromous fish.

However, the dam failed while P&S were being prepared impacting the fish migration and potentially affecting nearby Corps levees and a local irrigation ditch. The Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODFW) requested NWW to undertake an emergency action to breach the dam. Since NWW lacked authority to do this, a combat engineer battalion at Fort Lewis, Washington was contacted but they did not believe that it constituted an appropriate training exercise.

NWW acted as facilitator at meetings with the different stakeholders involved in the project (ODFW, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) and the local affiliate of Trout Unlimited) to consider different options. After much discussion, agreement was reached that the dam could be removed if a well was drilled to satisfy the water needs of the three irrigators at the dam. Various entities agreed to contribute the necessary funds and the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) acted as the contractor, for the removal of the dam.

While this was not a Corps action, NWW had collected much of the information necessary to reach an agreement as part of the Section 11335 study. The 1135 project had also provided the forum and an opportunity to interact, "get to know" the various players, and develop trust with the locals. All this allowed the decision process to successfully occur much more expeditiously. Most importantly, public resources (steelhead and bull trout) benefited from the actions that took place.

For further information, contact Mr. Chris Hyland, NWW PM at 509/527-7264. ❖

## Puyallup River Levee Rehabilitation Project

*Mike Scuderi - CENWS-ED-TB-ER*

In 1997, Seattle District conducted a congressionally directed levee rehabilitation project to assist Pierce County in the rehabilitation of several Non-Federal levees. The Water Resource Development Act of 1996 directed the Corps to provide technical assistance to Pierce County regarding levee repair and rehabilitation

alternatives for the Non-Federal levees along the Puyallup River.

The study began in November of 1996. Corps staff worked closely with Pierce County, the Puyallup Indian Tribe, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to develop a holistic plan to address the flood damages. The project mainly focussed on the segment of river upstream from the town of Orting. In this segment of river, several hundred feet of levee had been severely damaged if not completely destroyed.

The study team developed a plan that would create a system of set back levees and bank protection projects. Pierce County worked closely with FEMA and Washington Department of Ecology to buy out several properties along the river. The Corps designed the levees and bank protection to reclaim an abandoned levee that had been constructed in the 1930's. The total dollar amount of approved projects was \$2,888,000.

The first phase of construction occurred between September and December of 1997. Seattle District Emergency Management oversaw the construction of 3,000 linear feet of new levee, 2,600 linear feet of bank protection and repaired 1,000 linear feet of existing levee. Through the use of the rental equipment process and on-the-ground engineering, Emergency Management was able to ensure a quality project with significant cost savings. The second phase, completed in 1998, "connected the dots" of the first phase segments, completing a 10,000 linear foot length of levee.

A key feature of this project is that it opened up 120 acres of flood plain back to the river, thus incurring a net benefit to the environment. The project restored about 2,000 linear feet of a stream that was previously not accessible to migrating salmon. Signs of successful restoration were seen within days of opening the stream. Chum salmon were seen entering the stream for the first time in many years.

To incorporate the environmental features of this project, the Corps utilized the Washington Department of Ecology's Washington Conservation Corps (WCC). The WCC is a group founded in conjunction with the President's Americorps Education program. This program allows young adults (ages 18-25) to complete a valuable 12-month job skills and training program, under which they earn money and scholarships for college. WCC crew assisted in the construction of the

restored stream, adding key components, such as pools and riffles that will promote the stream's recovery. The crew also harvested, prepared and planted an estimated 50,000 willow shoots along the restored stream and levee alignment.

This project is being showcased as a creative and ecologically sound way to address issues of flood control. ❖

## Sammamish Weir Section 1135 Restoration Project

*Merri.S.Martz - CENWS-ED-TB-ER*

Seattle District completed construction of the Sammamish Weir Section 1135 Restoration Project in October 1998. The project is located on the Sammamish River, which runs between Lake Sammamish and Lake Washington east of Seattle, Washington. The Corps modified the Sammamish River for flood control purposes in the 1960s; flood control activities included deepening the channel, putting up levees, modifying the mouths of tributaries, removal of vegetation and some straightening. The weir is located at the upper end of the river and controls the summertime (low flow) elevation of Lake Sammamish. The weir was designed to allow fish passage at flows above 35 cfs (lowest recorded flow at time of construction). Since the 1960s river flows have fallen below 35 cfs numerous times (even as low as 18 cfs). All salmon bound for the Lake Sammamish system have to pass over the weir, and the original design blocked passage in these low flow years. Also, the riparian zone adjacent to the weir was highly degraded and eroding due to heavy public use (property is owned by King County Parks Department).

The restoration project proposed to modify the weir to have a narrower and deeper low flow notch, without reducing flood control or lowering the summertime elevation of Lake Sammamish. Also, the adjacent riparian zone would be graded, planted with native vegetation to stabilize the slopes, fenced and designated public access areas would be hardened with steps to further reduce erosion. The local sponsor for this project was King County. A local organized group of dog owners who use the park was also extremely helpful in

assisting with public outreach activities and provided significant volunteer labor with the planting and fencing during construction.

During construction, a number of challenges were encountered, such as how to divert the river flow around the project successfully; a six foot inflatable water bag was used as a coffer dam on the upstream side of the weir. Other challenges were how to ensure water quality was not affected during construction; water below the cofferdam was pumped onto a large field more than 300 feet from the riverbank to percolate before discharging to the river. In the end, however, the project was completed on schedule and within 10% of the budget.

The finished project provides: 1) greatly enhanced fish passage through the weir; 2) a resting pool immediately downstream of the weir which was used heavily by salmon in the fall of 1998; 3) a densely revegetated riparian zone of native plants; and 4) enhanced public access to the river with no erosion problems. The local sponsor and the public are extremely pleased with the results. A public volunteer group will monitor and maintain the riparian zone for the next 5 years. All in all, it was a highly successful project carried out in a heavily used suburban park. Other parks with heavy dog use are looking to this project as a model for their future restoration efforts. (Note: Corps policy requires that recreation features may not increase the Federal share by more than 10% and are to be cost shared 50/50. Ed.) ❖

## Native American Culture

*Paul Blakey – CECW-PC*

This is the second in a series of articles that we are presenting.

When working with Native Americans in our planning, operations and construction projects, one should keep in mind the culture and ideas that they share. The following, is extracted from Touch the Earth - a Self-Portrait of Indian Existence, compiled by T.C. McLuhan, published by Pocket Books, New York, NY:

*Born in 1868, Chief Luther Standing Bear spent his early years on the plains of Nebraska and South Dakota. At the age of 11, he was one of the*

*first students to enroll at the Indian school at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, which was established in 1879. After four years at the school he became a teacher and taught at the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota. He joined Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show as an interpreter in 1898 and spent his later years lecturing and writing. In his statement, Chief Standing Bear speaks of the Lakota, which is the tribal name of the western bands of Plains people now known as the Sioux (the eastern bands call themselves the Dakotas). Lakota tends to be used interchangeably with Dakota.*

“THE LAKOTA WAS A TRUE NATURIST- A LOVER OF NATURE. He loved the earth and all things of the earth, the attachment growing with age. The old people came literally to love the soil and they sat or reclined on the ground with a feeling of being close to a mothering power. It was good for the skin to touch the earth and the old people liked to remove their moccasins and walk with bare feet on the sacred earth. Their tipis were built upon the earth and their altars were made of earth. The birds that flew in the air came to rest upon the earth and it was the final abiding place of all things that lived and grew. The soil was soothing, strengthening, cleansing and healing.”

“That is why the old Indian still sits upon the earth instead of propping himself up and away from its life-giving forces. For him, to sit or lie upon the ground is to be able to think more deeply and to feel more keenly; he can see more clearly into the mysteries of life and come closer in kinship to other lives about him.”

“Kinship with all creatures of the earth, sky and water was a real and active principle. For the animal and bird world there existed a brotherly feeling that kept the Lakota safe among them and so close did some of the Lakotas come to their feathered and furred friends that in true brotherhood they spoke a common tongue.”

“The old Lakota was wise. He knew that man's heart away from nature becomes hard; he knew that lack of respect for growing, living things soon led to lack of respect for humans too. So he kept his youth close to its softening influence.” ❖

## Water Supply Handbook

*Ted Hillyer, CEWRC-IWR-P*

Work has been completed on the revision to IWR Report 96-PS-4, dated December 1996. The revised report (IWR Report 96-PS-4, dated December 1998) was distributed in early February. The new report updates the first five chapters and four appendices to incorporate the recent revisions to ER 1105-2-100 and to recognize the realignment of division boundaries. The new report also includes four additional chapters and two appendices covering the topics of "Modeling and Water Supply Planning", "Water Conservation and Planning for Drought", "Water Supply Needs Analysis", and "Management of Water Control Systems." The report is intended to serve as a comprehensive desk top reference on water supply topics that are spread throughout a voluminous body of Corps engineer regulations, manuals, technical letters and memoranda, as well as literature from the private sector. The information is intended for easy access and reference purpose only, and is not intended to serve as a substitute for Headquarters policy or implementation guidance. This document is available on the Institute for Water Resources Homepage at: <http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/>. The document will be updated as necessary and revisions will be posted on the Internet at this address. POC: Ted Hillyer, CEWRC-IWR-P, 703-428-6140. ❖

## Delegation of Authority for Water Supply Agreements and Reallocations

*Ted Hillyer, CEWRC-IWR-P*

An Institute for Water Resources report investigating if there are areas where further delegations of authority in the field of municipal and industrial water supply could be recommended has recently been sent to Headquarters, where it is under review. Almost since the inception of the current delegated limits in 1989, some districts and divisions have lobbied for additional authority. Now that new regulations and standard formats on water supply have been distributed, it was determined that this would be a good time to investigate this area. For this study, the water supply files of Headquarters were reviewed and an August 1998

letter from the Chief of Policy Division was sent to the divisions and districts requesting additional data. Report findings and conclusions show there are several areas where further delegation could be justified. Following Headquarters review, a recommendation will be presented to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works). The report (IWR Report 98-PS-3, dated December 1998) will be distributed to the divisions and districts after negotiations with the Office of the Assistant Secretary have been completed. POC: Ted Hillyer, CEWRC-IWR-P, 703-428-6140. ❖

## Submissions Deadline

The deadline for material for the next issue is 22 March 1999. ❖

*Planning Ahead*, is an unofficial publication authorized under AR 25-30. It is published by the Planning Division, Directorate of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20314-1000, (<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwnews.htm>) TEL 202-761-1969 or FAX 202-761-1972 or e-mail [Harry.E.Kitch@usace.army.mil](mailto:Harry.E.Kitch@usace.army.mil).